

REMARKS

Claims 1-50 are now presented for examination remain in this application .  
Claims 1-4, 13, 14, 19-24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 33, 37, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, and 50 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-4, 19-24, 37, and 38 are independent.

Claims 1-6, 15-24, 35-38, 49 and 50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,704,725 (Harvey et al.) in view of U.S. Patent 6,588,012 (Tanaka et al.). Claims 7-14, 25-28 and 39-42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harvey in view of Tanaka *et al.* and U.S. Patent 5,978,013 (Jones et al.). Claims 29-34 and 43-48 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harvey in view of Tanaka et al., Jones et al. and U.S. Patent 6,089,765 (Mori).

According to an aspect of the present invention to which Claim 1 relates, a digital broadcast receiving apparatus comprises means for setting of a digital broadcast program and a partial content provided in the program, in advance. The apparatus further includes means for receiving digital broadcast of the program and extracting information related to the set partial content from the received digital broadcast, and printing means for print-outputting the extracted information.

An aspect of the invention is that partial content in a digital broadcast can be printed. For example, in a case where the digital broadcast program is a cooking program and a recipe is provided in the cooking program as partial content, the recipe can

be printed out.<sup>11</sup> Notably, it is an aspect of the invention to set or designate the printing of the partial content in advance. Consequently, a user does not need to operate a receiving apparatus for printing on broadcast time in order to obtain the printed information.

As described in the Amendment filed November 24, 2004, Harvey relates to an apparatus for automatically controlling and monitoring radio and television transmissions. Apparently, this system can receive and print information relating to a broadcast, such as a recipe (see col. 20, line 18 - col. 21, line 5).

The Office Action cites col. 20, lines 22-64 and Fig. 6D of Harvey in support of the rejection of Claim 1. The cited passage of Harvey refers to a recipe that can be printed. However, the recipe is not understood to be provided in a television program but instead is provided only afterwards, when a cable converter box 222 is tuned to another channel to receive the recipe. The recipe is not understood, therefore, to be partial content provided in the program.

Also, at col. 20, lines 25-29, Harvey teaches that the television program watched by the viewer explains the steps the viewer needs to take to obtain the recipe. As such, in Harvey the viewer must first watch the television program, and it does not appear possible to set the printing of the recipe in advance.

With regard to Tanaka et al., as described in the Amendment filed November 24, 2004, that reference relates to a combination terminal unit that receives

---

<sup>11</sup>/ Of course, the scope of Claim 1 should not be construed as being limited to the mentioned example only.

various types of media signals, such as telephone, radio, fax, and cable television. As shown in Figs. 14 and 15, the user may perform a search of the various types of media by entering a search term. The results of the search are displayed in a list (Fig. 15), from which the user may select a desired program or other information to be retrieved. Tanaka et al. further discusses a scheduler that establishes a line connection to a predetermined information entity at a time designated by the input device.

Thus, Tanaka et al. teaches to search a program according to a topic designated by a user and reserving for recording the searched program if it is a TV program or a radio program. The topic indicates the whole program and does not indicate a partial content provided in a program.

It is respectfully submitted that nothing in either Harvey or Tanaka et al. would teach or suggest means for setting a digital broadcast program and a partial content provided in a program, in advance, and printing means for print-outputting extracted information related to the set partial content from a received digital broadcast, as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 1 is believed to be clearly patentable over Harvey and Tanaka et al., whether considered separately or in combination, and thus Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of that claim.

Independent Claims 2-4, 19-24, 37, and 38 include features that are similar in many relevant respects to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1, and also are believed to be patentable over Harvey and Tanaka et al., whether considered separately or

in combination, for substantially the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

A review of the other art of record, including Jones et al. and Mori, has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. All of the independent claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.


The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and its entry is therefore believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. In any event, entry of this Amendment After Final Action, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, he is respectfully requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Frank A. DeLucia  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 42,476

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY\_MAIN516108v1